

REMARKS

Claims 2-92 are now pending in the application. Claim 1 has been cancelled and Claims 91 and 92 have been added. Independent Claim 91 broadens the scope of protection. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-90 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones (U.S. Pat. No. 5,596,507) in view of Ahmed (U.S. Pat. No. 6,095,426) and Official Notice. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 as amended recites testing at least one of multiple components of the refrigeration system by performing at least one of a pressure drop test and an efficiency test on the at least one component of said multiple components. Jones, Ahmed, the Official Notice, and the combination thereof, do not teach, suggest, or disclose testing at least one of multiple components of the refrigeration system by performing at least one of a pressure drop test and an efficiency test, as discussed more fully below.

First, the Jones reference appears to simply monitor 15 temperature and amperage sensors, as listed at Jones, Col. 3, lines 5 – 43. The temperature and amperage sensors, however, are not used for testing system components by performing either a pressure drop test or an efficiency test, as recited by Claim 1 of the present invention.

Second, the Ahmed reference appears to simply utilize a temperature control loop for heating, a temperature control loop for cooling, and a pressure control loop.

Ahmed, Col. 3, lines 39-43. The pressure control loop is not related to pressure within the system, but rather, room pressure. Ahmed, Col. 3, line 66-67. The temperature control loop for heating, the temperature control loop for cooling, and the pressure control loop are not used for testing system components by performing either a pressure drop test or an efficiency test, as recited by Claim 1 of the present invention.

Third, the cited Official Notice that "specific parameters of the system control recited in the claims are conventional control parameters" does not teach, suggest or disclose testing at least one of multiple components of the refrigeration system by performing at least one of a pressure drop test and an efficiency test on the at least one component of said multiple components. Further the combination of Jones, Ahmed, and the cited Official Notice does not teach suggest or disclose testing at least one of multiple components of the refrigeration system by performing at least one of a pressure drop test and an efficiency test on the at least one component of said multiple components.

With regard to Claims 2-90, Applicants note that each either directly or indirectly depends from Claim 1, which defines over the prior art as discussed in detail above. Therefore, Claims 2-90 also define over the prior art and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 21, 2005

By: 
Michael Malinzak, Reg. No. 43,770

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MAM/MPD/ca